hv

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,709	08/28/2001	Michael K. Gschwind	YOR9-2001-0602 (8728-546)	5772

			EXAMINER
22150	7590	11/02/2005	CHOI, WOO H

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 WOODBURY ROAD
WOODBURY, NY 11797

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2189	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/940,709	GSCHWIND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Woo H. Choi	2189	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 August 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-37_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-8 and 10-37_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _9_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 20, 22, 23, 25 – 34, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Kumar (US Patent No. 6,678,790).

3.   With respect to claims 1, 2, and 29, Kumar discloses a data storage system (figure 1),

comprising:

at least one microprocessor (figure 1a, 26); and

a configurable memory (12), integrated with the at least one processor, for servicing the

at least one microprocessor in a first mode of operation that emulates a local, non-cache memory

and a second mode of operation that emulates a cache (abstract), wherein the configurable

memory comprises a memory array in which both tag bits (figure 2, 50) and data bits are stored

in a single data line (col. 3, lines 32 – 33) in the memory array (figure 1, 12), in the second mode

of operation, and

wherein a selection of any of the first mode of operation and the second mode of

operation is capable of being overridden by another selection of an other of the first mode of

operation and the second mode of operation (col. 2, lines 47 – 51).

The Examiner notes that the limitation added to claim 29 recites an optional feature.

4.   With respect to claims 22, 26, 30 and 33, the Examiner notes that each of the added

limitations claims a **capability** to select the first mode or the second mode. The do not require

mode selection based on an address comparison. Kumar's memory supports mode selection. It

is capable of supporting a mode selection based on an address comparison.

5.   With respect to claim 3, wherein the configurable memory is capable of having either the

first mode of operation or the second mode of operation selected at a burn-in time (mode

selection is under software control, making the mode selection possible anytime while the system

is up and running, including "a burn-in time", i.e. a period of initial operation of a new device).

6.   With respect to claim 4, the configurable memory is capable of having either the first

mode of operation or the second mode of operation selected at a power-up time (col. 2, lines 51 –

55).

7.   With respect to claim 5, the first mode of operation or the second mode of operation is

selected at the power-up time using an external signal (col. 2, lines 51 – 55).

8.   With respect to claim 6, the configurable memory is capable of having either the first

mode of operation or the second mode of operation selected during a program execution (col. 2,

lines 47 – 48).

9.   With respect to claim 7, the first mode of operation or the second mode of operation is

selected during the program execution based upon a value of a special configuration register (col.

2, lines 47 – 48).

11.   With respect to claim 8, the first mode of operation or the second mode of operation is

selected during the program execution based upon a value of an external signal (col. 2, lines 48 –

51, control register is loaded by the CPU which is external to the memory).

12.   With respect to claims 10 – 14, the configurable memory is **capable** of having either the

first mode of operation or the second mode of operation selected based upon a result of

comparing a supplied address to a range of addresses. (the claim only require a capability but not

actual mode setting based on the addresses, this only requires that the structure can switch modes

and can compare addresses, both of which are taught by Kumar),

   Dependent claims 11 – 14 relate to the capability discussed above.

13.   With respect to claims 15 and 23, the configurable memory comprises:

   a memory array (figure 2, 52); and

memory configuration logic for selecting the first mode of operation or the second mode

of operation (figure 1, 16, figure 2, 58).

14.   With respect to claim 16, the configurable memory is capable of selecting one of a local

memory read mode and a local memory write mode in the first mode of operation and is further

capable of selecting one of a cache read mode and a cache write mode in the second mode of

operation (read mode, i.e. mode of operation while reading, and write mode, i.e. mode of

operation while writing, are inherent in this type of memory, either in cache mode or local

memory mode).

15.   With respect to claim 17, the selection may be overridden by the other selection

dynamically (col. 2, lines 47 – 51).

16.   With respect to claim 18, the configurable memory comprises a plurality of static random

access memory cells (col. 3, lines 34 – 35).

17.   With respect to claim 19, the configurable memory comprises a plurality of dynamic

random access memory cells (col. 3, lines 34 – 35).

18.   With respect to claim 20, the configurable memory is capable of being dynamically

employed as a sole memory (abstract, main memory) serving the processor and as a portion of a

larger, memory hierarchy (abstract, cache, see also col. 1, lines 18 – 24, cache is a portion of a larger memory hierarchy that includes a cache memory and a main memory).

19.   With respect to claim 25, the memory system further comprises:

        tag match logic for determining a match between the stored tag bits and bits corresponding to a memory access (figure 12, 80, 82); and

        at least one multiplexer (44) for selecting and outputting data corresponding to the memory access, when the match is determined.

20.   With respect to claims 27, 28, 31, 32, and 34, the at least one microprocessor and the configurable memory array are integrated on a single chip/package (figure 1a, see also col. 2, lines 33 – 35).

21.   With respect to claim 37, said integrating step integrates the at least one microprocessor (figure 1b, 26) with the configurable memory based upon a multi-chip (11 and 13) module.

22.   Claims 1, 10 – 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baltz (US Patent No. 6,321,318).

23.   With respect to claims 1 and 10 – 14, Baltz discloses a memory system on a chip (abstract), comprising:

a configurable memory having a first mode of operation wherein the configurable

memory is configured as a cache and a second mode of operation wherein the configurable

memory is configured as a local, non-cache memory (abstract), wherein the configurable

memory comprises a memory array (figure 9, 30, more specifically, 31 and 32) for storing tag

bits and data bits in a single data line in the memory array, in the first mode of operation,

wherein the configurable memory is **capable** of having either the first mode of operation or the

second mode of operation selected based upon a result of comparing a supplied address to a

range of addresses. (the claim only require a capability but not actual mode setting based on the

addresses, this only requires that the structure can switch modes and can compare addresses, both

of which are taught by Baltz, additionally, see col. 2, lines 38 – 46).

Dependent claims 11 – 14 relate to the capability discussed above.

24.   With respect to claim 21, Baltz discloses that the first mode of operation and the second

mode of operation are employed concurrently (col. 9, lines 9 – 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

26.   Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar in view of

Sample *et al*. (US Patent No. 6,377,912, hereinafter "Sample"), or in the alternative, in view of

Natarajan (US Patent No. 6,611,796).

Kumar discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim as discussed above. However,

Kumar does not specifically disclose macro cells to implement memory system. On the other

hand, Sample (col. 29, lines 11 – 17, col. 31, lines 27 – 33) and Natarajan (col. 4, lines 16 – 23)

disclose the use of macro cells in IC memory chip designs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Kumar and Sample or Natarajan before him at the time the invention was made, to use the design

techniques using macros teachings of Sample or Natarajan in the design of Kumar's system, in

order to be able to verify electronic circuit designs before fabrication (Sample 16 – 18, Natarajan

23 – 26).

27.   Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar

in view of Isaak (US Patent No. 6,426,549).

Kumar discloses all of the limitation of the parent claim as discussed above. However,

Kumar does not specifically disclose methods of integrating the claimed memory package using

a chip stack and a flip chip techniques. On the other hand, Issak discloses both of these

techniques (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Kumar and Isaak before him at the time the invention was made, to use the IC packaging

teachings of Isaak to make the configurable memory IC of Kumar, in order to be able to actually

produce the memory devices.   Isaak's method uses available materials and known process

techniques and is suitable for automated production methods (col. 3, lines 49 – 53).

Allowable Subject Matter

28.   Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

29.   Applicant's arguments regarding the "a memory array in which both tag bits and data bits

are stored in a single line in the memory array" have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Kumar clearly discloses a reconfigurable memory array (figure 1, 12, or figure 2,

12) that contain tag bits and data bits in the same array (12). Each row of the tag array 50

corresponds to one of the data lines in the data array 52 (col. 3, lines 32 – 33) forming a single

logical data line in the memory array 12.

Conclusion

30.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Woo H. Choi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4179. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

whc

October 27, 2005

BEHZAD JAMES PEIKARI
PRIMARY EXAMINER